of Texas, which provided that the Legislature should not have the right to levy taxes or impose burdens on the people, except to raise revenue sufficient for the economical administration of the government. As one of the purposes of government is to protect citizens in the use and enjoyment of their property, the aforesaid act is clearly in pursuance of that object and not in conflict with the Constitution.

Personal Injuries — Permission to Examine Machinery — Liability of Proprietor for Negligence — License — Assumption of Risk. — *Benson* v. *Baltimore Traction Co.*, 26 Atl. Rep. 973 (Md.). This was an action for personal injuries caused by the defendant's negligence. It was held that a company cannot be held liable for injuries to persons or parties to whom they had granted a mere license, upon their request to visit and inspect the works and machinery of the company, on the ground that it is not for the benefit of the company that the injured party visited their works. Therefore the company are not responsible if they are in any way injured while viewing the company's work-shop. Had the company urged or solicited visitors to come and view their works and machinery, the law would have required them to keep their visitors from all injury.

Injury to Servant — Extent of Employer's Liability. — *East Tennessee V. & G. Ry. Co.* v. *Reynolds*, 20 S. E. Rep. 70 (Ga.). Where through the negligence of a railroad engineer an accident occurred to a train and the conductor assumed the duty of trying to avoid other accidents which might have resulted from this first one, and while walking along the track in order to flag an approaching train, slipped on a tie and was injured, and it was proved that conductor used unnecessary haste and poor judgment in exposing himself to danger, the court held he could not recover, even though it was shown that had there been a proper number of train hands present the conductor would not have been injured. The negligence of engineer was too remote and when one accepts employment he assumes the ordinary risks and casualties of that business.

Court — Adjournment Term. — *Hodnett* v. *Stone*, 20 S. E. Rep. 43 (Ga. Supreme). The defendant moved to dismiss the case because the declaration in attachment upon which the case rested had not been filed at the first term of the court according to law. Owing to the physical inability of the judge, the February term

of the Superior Court had not been held but had been adjourned until the eleventh of April, upon which day the declaration had been filed. The motion was dismissed on the ground that a term of court legally adjourned over to a later time is, when held, the same term as to process and pleading.

Conversion — What Constitutes. — Valentine et al. v. *Duff et al.*, 34 N. E. Rep. 453 (Ind.). The complaint alleges a wrongful taking of the property and the sale of it to the appellee, but it is shown that no demand was made upon the appellee for the property and he therefore had no opportunity to refuse a delivery of the same to the rightful owner. There is no liability created unless he either refused to deliver the property upon such demand or converted it to his own use so that he could not have complied with such a demand if made.